REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants have received the Office Action dated May 1, 2007, in which the Examiner: 1) objected claims 2-8 because of informalities; 2) rejected claims 12 and 20-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter; and 3) rejected claims 1-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by Biswas et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 7,174,383, hereinafter "Biswas"). With this Response, Applicants have amended claims 1-9, 11, 13, 16, 18, and 20, and canceled claims 12, 14, 15, 17, and 21.

I. CLAIM OBJECTIONS

The objection to claims 2-8 has been addressed by removing the word "computer" from the preambles of such claims.

II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 101

The § 101 rejection of claim 12 is moot due to the cancellation of claim 12. With regard to claim 20, the Examiner stated that "claim 20 recites 'a method using SSO server." No such language is found in claim 20. Clarification is respectfully requested as to why the Examiner is rejecting claim 20 under § 101. At any rate, claim 20 requires accessing a host server, automatically re-directing to a sign-on server, retrieving credentials/requesting the entry of a user credentials, re-directing back to the host server, the host server authenticating the user, and encrypting the credentials. This combination of limitations has a tangible and concrete result.

III. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claim 1 has been amended to require that "a unique public key being associated with each host server" and that "sign-on credentials are used to authenticate the user upon accessing each host server, and wherein said sign-on credentials are encrypted with the public key associated with the host server for which the sign-on credentials were most recently used to authenticate the user." While Biswas does mention encryption, Biswas does not teach or even suggest each host has a unique public key and that "sign-on credentials are encrypted with the public key associated with the host server for which the sign-on

credentials were most recently used to authenticate the user." For at least this reason, claim 1 and its dependent claims are allowable.

Claim 9 has been amended to specify that the "credentials are encrypted using a public key associated with the host server that the client workstation most recently accessed." As explained above, Biswas has no such teaching. For at least this reason, claim 9 and its dependent claims are allowable. Dependent claim 11 has been amended per the amendment to claim 9.

Claim 13 has been amended to specify that the user credentials are encrypted using public keys associated with the host and second computers. Biswas has no such teaching. For at least this reason, claim 13 and its dependent claims are allowable.

Claim 16 has been amended to require that the host computer's CPU "decrypts the credentials using a private key associated with the host computer." Applicants find mention in Biswas of using a private key associated with a host computer to decrypt credentials. For at least this reason, claim 16 is allowable.

Claim 18 has been amended to include "means for encrypting user credentials using a public key associated with a means for hosting, a different public key being associated with each of multiple means for hosting." As explained above, Biswas has no such teaching. For at least this reason, claim 18 and its dependent claims are allowable.

Claim 20 has been amended to include "encrypting said user credentials with a public key associated with the host server that the user most recently accessed, a different public key being associated with each of multiple host servers." As explained above, Biswas has no such teaching. For at least this reason, claim 20 and its dependent claims are allowable.

IV.   CONCLUSION

In the course of the foregoing discussions, Applicants may have at times referred to claim limitations in shorthand fashion, or may have focused on a particular claim element. This discussion should not be interpreted to mean that the other limitations can be ignored or dismissed. The claims must be viewed as a whole, and each limitation of the claims must be considered when determining

the patentability of the claims. Moreover, it should be understood that there may be other distinctions between the claims and the cited art which have yet to be raised, but which may be raised in the future.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. It is believed that no extensions of time or fees are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a), and any fees required (including fees for net addition of claims) are hereby authorized to be charged to Hewlett-Packard Development Company's Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jonathan M. Harris/
Jonathan M. Harris
PTO Reg. No. 44,144
CONLEY ROSE, P.C.
(713) 238-8000 (Phone)
(713) 238-8008 (Fax)
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
Legal Dept., M/S 35
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400